

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ALLURRA SHUFORD and
ALAUNNA SHUFORD, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MATOKA PAULETTE SHUFORD,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JASON WILLIAM WIGGINS,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

July 20, 2006

No. 267520

Calhoun Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 04-000310-NA

Before: Neff, P.J., and Bandstra and Zahra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

The children came into care following reports that they had been sexually assaulted, and respondent-appellant made statements to the police that her live-together partner had been spending time alone with the girls in their bedroom. Following sexual assault examinations, it was determined that one of the girls had suffered blunt force trauma to her hymen. Respondent-appellant admitted at adjudication that, although she had been given information regarding sexual assault services and counseling for the children, she had not scheduled any services for them. She also admitted that she did not have adequate housing to care for and protect her children.

The evidence at the termination hearings clearly demonstrated that, because of respondent-appellant's chaotic lifestyle and lack of stable housing, the statutory grounds for termination were supported. Respondent-appellant's counselor and caseworker thought that respondent-appellant was very smart and capable of accomplishing the goals of her case service plan. However, respondent-appellant's inability to obtain and maintain housing for her children, even after a second chance by the trial court, demonstrated a lack of parental responsibility and commitment to her children. Accordingly, the trial court properly terminated her parental rights.

Affirmed.

/s/ Janet T. Neff

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra

/s/ Brian K. Zahra